



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,656	10/04/2006	Sebastien Bardon	Q95593	8871
23373	7590	03/31/2009	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC			ORLANDO, AMBER ROSE	
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.				
SUITE 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20037			1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/31/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/596,656	BARDON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	AMBER ORLANDO	1797	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 June 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>06/20/2006</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Merriman US 2,952,579.
3. For claim 10, Merriman reference disclose the reinforcement means comprises at least one mesh-like reinforcement element which has independent coherence and which comprises at least one active portion which is generally of substantially planar form (claim 1).
4. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Adiletta US 5,228,891.
5. For claim 10, the Adiletta reference, the reinforcement means comprises at least one mesh-like reinforcement element which has independent coherence and which comprises at least one active portion which is generally of substantially planar form ((figure 3 object 59)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
4. Claims 1 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita et al. WO03/048072 (translation provided by US 7,138,168) in view of Merriman US 2,952,579.

Art Unit: 1797

5. For claim 1, the Fujita et al. reference discloses a filtration structure, in particular a particulate filter for exhaust gases of an internal combustion engine of the type comprising: at least first and second filtration elements which have a first and second face which are arranged opposite each other, respectively; a joint for connecting the faces which extends between the faces, this joint comprising a binding agent (figure 1b objects 12 and 8). The reference does not disclose the joint comprising reinforcement means which are embedded in a binding agent, characterized in that the reinforcement means comprises at least one mesh-like reinforcement element which has independent coherence and which comprises at least one active portion which is generally of substantially planar form.

6. The Merriman reference discloses the joint comprising reinforcement means which are embedded in a binding agent, characterized in that the reinforcement means comprises at least one mesh-like reinforcement element which has independent coherence and which comprises at least one active portion which is generally of substantially planar form (claim 1).

7. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Fujita et al. reference to include the joint comprising reinforcement means which are embedded in a binding agent, characterized in that the reinforcement means comprises at least one mesh-like reinforcement element which has independent coherence and which comprises at least one active portion which is generally of substantially planar form (Merriman claim 1) because this provides a reinforcing means for increasing the strength of the adhesive bond.

Art Unit: 1797

8. For claim 7, the Fujita et al. reference discloses the binding agent having an active portion opposite two adjacent faces of the filtration element, the active portions being connected to each other (figure 1b objects 12 and 8. The reference does not disclose the reinforcement element comprises an active portion opposite two adjacent faces of the filtration element, the active portions being connected to each other.

9. The Merriman reference discloses the reinforcement element comprising an active portion on two sides of the element (claim 1) being used within the binding agent. The reference does not disclose the reinforcement elements active portion being on two adjacent faces of the element and being connected to each other. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the reference to include the reinforcement elements active portion being on two adjacent faces of the element and being connected to each other (as done by the adhesive within the Fujita et al. reference) because this provides greater strength on all sides of the element.

10. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Fujita et al. reference to include the reinforcement element comprises an active portion opposite two adjacent faces of the filtration element, the active portions being connected to each other (Merriman claim 1) because provides a greater structural integrity to the adhesive and therefore the filter.

11. For claim 8, the Fujita reference discloses the structure comprises at least one cell which comprises four filtration elements, and a common reinforcement element 3), having a sinuous shape, for the filtration elements, the common reinforcement element

Art Unit: 1797

comprising at least three successive active portions which are arranged opposite adjacent faces of the filtration elements of the cell (figure 1b objects 12 and 8).

12. For claim 9, the Fujita reference discloses the at least first and second cells and a binding agent supporting between those cells (figure 1b objects 8 and 12). The reference does not disclose at least one active portion of the reinforcement element of the first cell being arranged opposite a face of a filtration element of the second cell.

13. The Merriman reference discloses the reinforcement element within the adhesive (claim 1).

14. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Fujita et al. reference to include the reinforcement element (Merriman claim 1) because this provides a reinforcing means for increasing the strength of the adhesive bond.

15. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Fujita et al. reference to include at least first and second cells, at least one active portion of the reinforcement element of the first cell being arranged opposite a face of a filtration element of the second cell because by moving around the reinforcement element within the honeycomb, the best placement in order to maintain structural integrity of the structure while limiting costs can be found.

16. Claims 2-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita et al. WO03/048072 (translation provided by US 7,138,168) and US 2,952,579 as applied in claim 1 above and further in view of Adiletta US 5,228,891.

Art Unit: 1797

17. For claim 2, the Fujita et al. reference does not disclose the active portion comprises a plurality of beams which are arranged substantially parallel with a first direction.

18. The Adiletta reference discloses the active portion comprises a plurality of beams which are arranged substantially parallel with a first direction (figure 3 object 59).

19. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Fujita et al. reference to include the active portion comprises a plurality of beams which are arranged substantially parallel with a first direction (Adiletta figure 3 object 59) because this provides support to the filtering element.

20. For claim 3, the Fujita et al. reference does not disclose the active portion comprises a plurality of cross-members which connect the beams and which are arranged substantially parallel with a second direction, distinct from the first direction.

21. The Adiletta reference discloses the active portion comprises a plurality of cross-members which connect the beams and which are arranged substantially parallel with a second direction, distinct from the first direction (figure 3 object 59).

22. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Fujita et al. reference to include the active portion comprises a plurality of cross-members which connect the beams and which are arranged substantially parallel with a second direction, distinct from the first direction (Adiletta figure 3 object 59) because this provides support to the filtering element.

Art Unit: 1797

23. For claim 4, the Fujita et al. reference does not disclose the total volume of the apertures delimited by the beams and the cross-members is greater than the total volume of the beams and the cross-members.

24. The Adiletta reference discloses the total volume of the apertures delimited by the beams and the cross-members is greater than the total volume of the beams and the cross-members (as can be easily seen figure 3 object 59).

25. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Fujita et al. reference to include the total volume of the apertures delimited by the beams and the cross-members to be greater than the total volume of the beams and the cross-members (Adiletta figure 3 object 59) because this allows the filter to be supported and for the flow of air.

26. For claims 5 and 6, the Fujita et al. reference does not disclose the reinforcement element is produced from a metal material and the reinforcement element is produced from a material which degrades at temperatures greater than 150°C.

27. The Adiletta reference discloses the reinforcement element is produced from a metal material and the reinforcement element is produced from a material which degrades at temperatures greater than 150°C (column 6, lines 19-31).

28. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Fujita et al. reference to include the reinforcement element is produced from a metal material and the reinforcement element is produced from a material which degrades at temperatures greater than 150°C

Art Unit: 1797

(Adiletta column 6, lines 19-31) because this allows the supporting material to withstand high temperatures.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AMBER ORLANDO whose telephone number is (571)270-3149. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. (6:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Walter Griffin can be reached on (571) 272-1447. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Walter D. Griffin/
Supervisory Patent Examiner,
Art Unit 1797

AO